

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al  
 Serial No.: 10/533,452  
 Filed: May 2, 2005  
 Office Action Mailing Date: April 7, 2010

Examiner: Kenny S. Lin  
 Group Art Unit: 2452  
 Attorney Docket: 29837  
 Confirmation No. 4135

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 - 357 are in this Application. Claims 1 – 175, 199 – 227, 230 – 251 260 – 262, 272 – 277, 283, 287 – 297, 299, 302 – 329, 331 – 333, 336 – 343, and 353 – 357 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 176 – 198, 228, 229, 252 – 259, 263 – 271, 278 – 282, 284 – 286, 298, 300, 301, 330, 334, 335 and 344 – 352 have been rejected. Claims 1 – 175, and 355 - 357 have been canceled without prejudice herewith. Claims 176, 180, 344 and 348 have been amended herewith.

### **Amendments To The Claims**

#### **35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections**

Claims 180 and 348 have been amended to depend from their base claims and not from 179 and 347 respectively, thereby to avoid the interpretation issue raised by the Examiner.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Claims 176 and 344 have been rejected over Bisbee.

Claims 176 and 344 have been amended in order to more particularly claim the invention for which protection is required.

Restoration to consideration of the withdrawn species is hereby requested on the basis that amended claims 176 and 344 are allowable and generic to all the species.

Regarding the issue of novelty, the present claims are distinguished over Bisbee in that Bisbee *does not permit the information object to evolve*. The "elementary information unit" of Bisbee is an electronic signature, which fails the identification process if anything has changed in the information object. The present

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al  
 Serial No.: 10/533,452  
 Filed: May 2, 2005  
 Office Action Mailing Date: April 7, 2010

Examiner: Kenny S. Lin  
 Group Art Unit: 2452  
 Attorney Docket: 29837  
 Confirmation No. 4135

claim, by contrast with Bisbee, requires that the elementary information units identify the information objects *despite the information objects being subject to evolution*. See at least Bisbee lines 64 – 66 (forgery resistant indicium), column 6 lines 21 – 24 (submitted signed information objects...testing integrity of the contents...).

Regarding inventive step, Bisbee is silent on the possibility of managing the information in the face of modification. The importance that Bisbee attaches to the information being an exact copy precludes even allowing the information to be modified.

Taking a broader view of the present embodiments, these relate to the management of information that evolves with time. In order for computerized systems to manage information the information must be identified, but computers generally are good at exact matching and notoriously bad at fuzzy or inexact matching.

The skilled person, faced with the present problem of identifying data that evolves over time would consult Bisbee et al, as cited by the Examiner but would see only that exact matching is suggested – as discussed above. Bisbee uses exact matching to find the information objects, and indeed the checking of signatures that Bisbee recommends is not only an exact match but actually explicitly rejects matches where the slightest change has been made, since the signature no longer matches the document.

The skilled person, seeing that Bisbee is not adequate for data that changes over time, may then be expected to go on to consider various systems of fuzzy searching, as this seems the obvious approach.

The present embodiments however take a *counter-intuitive* approach. Contrary to what the skilled person would expect, exact matching *is* used. Obviously the information objects have changed but *basic information units* do not change. Hence what is done is to search using *exact matching* for the *basic information units* and then use *these information units* to *learn about the identity of the information objects* and thus apply management to the information objects even though they may

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al  
Serial No.: 10/533,452  
Filed: May 2, 2005  
Office Action Mailing Date: April 7, 2010

Examiner: Kenny S. Lin  
Group Art Unit: 2452  
Attorney Docket: 29837  
Confirmation No. 4135

have been subject to evolution over time of their content and they themselves *cannot* be found using exact matching.

The following, not found in Bisbee, and believed to be counter-intuitive to the skilled person for the reasons given above, are thus regarded as patentable subject matter:

monitoring information usage to detect information objects therein, said information objects being *subject to said evolving*;

*finding elementary information units within* at least one detected information object, said elementary information units *remaining constant under said evolving*;

*deducing information about an identity of said information object* from identification of said elementary information units found within said information object; and

*managing said information object based on said information deduced about said identity from said elementary information units*, thereby to provide management of said information that is resilient to said evolving.

The remaining pending claims are believed to be allowable for being dependent on allowable main claims.

The remaining withdrawn claims are believed to be allowable as being dependent on an allowable generic claim and it is requested that these are restored to consideration.

In re Application of: Ariel PELED et al  
Serial No.: 10/533,452  
Filed: May 2, 2005  
Office Action Mailing Date: April 7, 2010

Examiner: Kenny S. Lin  
Group Art Unit: 2452  
Attorney Docket: 29837  
Confirmation No. 4135

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 176 - 354 are now in condition for allowance. A prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

***/Jason H. Rosenblum/***

Jason H. Rosenblum  
Registration No. 56,437  
Telephone: 718.246.8482

Date: August 9, 2010

**Enclosures:**

- Petition for Extension (one Month)